DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 257 SO 010 143

AUTHOR Speiker, Charles A.; Curtis, Thomas E.
TITLE A Tri-Level Study of Arts Education: Report to the "Arts, Education and Americans Panel."
INSTITUTION Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art Education; Bias; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; Curriculum Research; Data Analysis; Data Collection; *Educational Assessment; Educational Finance; Educational Improvement; *Educational Needs; Educational Trends; *National Surveys; Questionnaires; Research Needs; Secondary Education; State Federal Aid; Statistical Analysis; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

The document discusses a national survey undertaken to determine areas of needed research and policy development in art education. Secondary school principals, curriculum leaders, and state art supervisors were surveyed to determine the current status and future needs of art education. Findings among principals indicated that 59% of the 125 respondents noted that art education increased in importance in 1975 over the preceding year. On the district level, a majority of 345 art education supervisors noted a stable employment, financial, and instructional materials situation. Most frequently mentioned obstacles to art education on the district level were lack of commitment to the arts as an educational priority, and lack of money, time, personnel, and space for art instruction. On the state level, approximately 30% of the 52 state and territorial respondents observed an increase in art education personnel within their state. It was concluded that additional research of a broader and more sophisticated nature is necessary, a symposium concerning the improvements of the image and the visibility of art education must be undertaken, and further dialogue between people concerned with art in American education letters are presented in the appendix.
(Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141257

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Tri-Level Study of Arts Education:

Report to the "Arts, Education and Americans Panel"

Dr. Charles A. Speiker
Associate Director
Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development

Dr. Thomas E. Curtis
Professor
State University of New York
at Albany

SP 010 143

March, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

- background....1
- purposes....1

Rationale 2

Methodology 3

- building level....4
- district level....5
- state level....6

Findings 6

- building level....6
- district level....8
  - personnel....8
  - curriculum development monies....9
  - instructional materials monies....9
  - large districts....10
  - perceived importance....11
  - obstacles....11
- state level....14
  - personnel....15
  - monies for curriculum, instruction....16
  - time regulated....16
  - judged importance....16
  - obstacles....17

Conclusions 18

- secondary building level....18
- district level....19
- state level....21

Recommendations 22

- research....22
- strengthening arts education....22
- policy shaping....24
- summary conclusions....25

Appendices

A. letters and instruments used in survey
B. assorted letters of support
C. ASCD Board Resolution

INTRODUCTION

It is the purpose of this report to describe the background and rationale to, the methodology for, the results of, and the recommendations from three national surveys. The surveys concentrated on "Arts Education" and were designed to elicit information from principals, central office administrators, and state department personnel.

This report is intended to be a companion to, or contained in, a more comprehensive study entitled "The Arts, Education, and Americans." The more comprehensive study is coordinated by Ms. Margaret Howard of the American Council for the Arts in Education and is funded by the National Endowment for the Arts, the U. S. Office of Education, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and the John D. Rockefeller, III Fund.

Background

In an attempt to strengthen the data base of the larger study, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) offered to assist Project Director, Ms. Howard, wherever possible due to a current ASCD Board of Directors resolution supporting the arts. Dr. Charles A. Speiker (ASCD), Dr. Thomas E. Curtis (SUNY at Albany) and Dr. Charles B. Fowler, a project consultant, met to discuss alternative research strategies.

It was assumed that a general assessment of the field as perceived by various audiences was needed. It was further assumed that opinions concerning the "health" of arts education was needed. This data was to be used to generate recommendations for planning next steps and eventual policy and curriculum shaping for state and local settings.

Purpose

The conductors of the research, Dr's. Speiker and Curtis, agreed from the onset of this project that the primary purpose of the surveys was to determine where (if any) further research and development was needed. Further, they agreed to test a methodology of data collection and attempt to assess reaction

of various audiences to a project in the arts. At a time when accountability, scientism, behavioral objectives, and the three R's seemed to be indicators of predominant thinking, it was thought that activities in arts education might be overlooked. This working attitude was adopted in order to neutralize a possible bias of the researchers.

A final purpose of the survey was to bring to the surface associations such as ASCD and their desire to be of assistance. In this period of inflating costs, associations stand ready to aid other agencies in the spirit of volunteerism. Due to this spirit, the cost of the activity was so minimal as to suggest new directions in funding grants.

Succinctly put, the main purposes of these surveys were:

1. to assess the perceptions of the current status of arts education
    - 1.1 determine the importance of arts education at the individual building level
    - 1.2 determine the importance of arts education at the district level
    - 1.3 determine the importance of arts education at the state level
2. to develop recommendations for strengthening arts education in American schools
    - 2.1 determine obstacles at the district level
    - 2.2 determine obstacles at the state level
3. to develop policy shaping strategies
    - 3.1 test methodologies
    - 3.2 test volunteer-based cooperative approaches

RATIONALE

The researchers were impressed by the importance of the directions and parameters of the investigation suggested by the Rockefeller Panel. The lack of information concerning perceptions of various clienteles relating to current developments in arts education presented opportunity for significant research of an introductory nature. Such research, in order to be of greatest impact,

should be directed to state level, school district level, and individual building level personnel. It was expected that results might indicate national trends for arts education, and either support or refute various opinions being expressed by both those expressing optimism and pessimism concerning arts education in America.

A rationale for the study was based upon perception and its expression through carefully constructed surveys. These questionnaires, by their introductory nature, were relatively superficial. However, responses were intended to indicate, not only current trends, but also possible future directions for more sophisticated studies which would present a broad in-depth spectrum of the current situation in arts education.

Perception studies present certain implicit disadvantages recognized by the researchers. Respondents may have varying purposes in their responses; questions may not be similarly understood by all respondents; and, other such variables create a certain question about validity and/or reliability when survey techniques are utilized. It was the considered opinion of the researchers that such possible weaknesses were more than offset by the breadth of the sample reached and the number of broad areas of questions investigated. Every research problem must face this dilemma of sharpness of focus. At this elementary stage in the knowledge of the state of the arts in American education, it was determined that breadth carried a higher priority than depth. Certainly more sharply focused future studies, based upon information derived from this survey, should be encouraged.

METHODOLOGY

Even though a research team based in New York City was carrying on extensive data collection activities, it was agreed that the three surveys reported here were designed to address three levels of the educational institution: the building level - the district level - and the state level.

Below the methodology for collecting and analyzing the data from each level is described.

Building Level

125 secondary schools were sampled from throughout the United States. The names of the respondents were taken from ASCD membership lists. An original sample of 100 was increased due to a noticeable absence of respondents from the southwestern states.

Each respondent was mailed a cover letter and response card. The cover letter explained that ASCD was assisting the Rockefeller chaired panel due to its (ASCD) program focus and concerns in curriculum, instruction and supervision. The cover letter further noted the need for base line data on changes in arts education and defined arts education as: music, visual arts, and theater, as well as courses or instruction in creative writing, dance media (study of film and T.V.) and architecture (see Appendix A, Item 1 at end of report for the full letter).

The response card was a self-mailing instrument that asked the building administrators to compare last year to this year in terms of arts education activity. The amount of money spent, student time used, or number of courses offered in arts education were to be reviewed. Then they were to determine whether:

(a) arts education is increasing in importance;

(b) arts education is remaining the same; or

(c) arts education is decreasing in importance.

The response card asked respondents to identify themselves for follow-up purposes and to state the number of students served.

Three weeks after the initial mailing, a complete set of materials was sent to those persons not responding to the two previous request (see Appendix A, Item 2 for card).

The data gained from these mailings was analyzed by simple percent responses. A table and discussion of this data is reported in the next section.

District Level

530 Assistant Superintendents in charge of program, directors of curriculum or curriculum coordinators throughout the United States were sampled. The names of the respondents were taken from the ASCD membership lists. An original sample of 500 was increased to compensate for absence of participants from the northwestern section of the United States.

The procedure and cover letter described for the building level sample was the same used for the district level. The response card was more comprehensive (see Appendix A, Item 3 for a description of the district level card).

The district level card was divided into two parts. Part A contained questions that asked for information about:

- arts education personnel
- monies allocated for curriculum development
- monies allocated for instructional materials.

Respondents were asked to compare last year to this year (1976-1977) on each of the above items and note whether there was an increase, no change, or a decrease. They were also given the option to note whether personnel or monies were available for comparison. For example, it may have been the case that certain districts did not go into comprehensive curriculum development activities. Rather, they may have only purchased instructional materials for teacher initiated activities.

The data from Part A was to assist in determining changes that have or are occurring generally. Districts of 20,000 pupils and more were isolated to determine whether or not specific changes were occurring there and not in smaller districts.

Part B contained data on the respondents view of the importance of arts education (high, average, low). They were also asked to note the single greatest obstacle to arts education in their district (if any existed). Finally, these

respondents were asked to provide their names for follow-up purposes, and to record the number of students served by that district.

State Level

The mailing list of Chief State School Officers was used to send a special cover letter, a response form and a reply envelope. The mailing list contained the names of chief education officers of the fifty states and six territories of the United States.

The cover letter explained ASCD's role in the total project, defined arts eudcation, and mentioned a recent ASCD resolution supporting arts education. The follow-up procedure was similar to the other surveys (see Appendix A, Items four and five for a description of the materials used).

The instrument attempted to gather state wide data on:

(a) increase or decrease in the number of arts education personnel employed

(b) increase or decrease in monies allocated for curriculum development

(c) increase or decrease in monies for instructional materials

(d) increase or decrease in time allocated by state regulations for arts education and the "judged" opinion of the importance of arts education in the state

A final open ended question asked respondents to state the single greatest obstacle in the advancement of the arts in their state.

FINDINGS

This section contains the findings of the three surveys and a brief discussion on each survey. The recommendations in the last section are based upon those findings. Each survey will be discussed separately. The section concludes with summary comments about the total project or comments that are generalizable to all the surveys.

Building Level

This survey was sent to 125 secondary school principals. One hundred

responses (eighty percent) of these surveys were received. The majority of respondents were principals. In a few instances the arts education department chairperson responded to the request.

The range of school size was from 105 students served to 4,650 students served. Due to the nature of the study, the selected sample was small. However, public and private schools were sampled as well as urban, ex-urban, suburban and rural schools. Additionally all geographic sections of the United States were included.

Respondents were asked to collect data on the number of courses offered, student time spent in arts, and monies allocated to arts education (taking inflation into account). Their responses based upon their investigations are noted in Table 1.

Table 1. Secondary School Changes in Arts Education

	R	P
NOTED INCREASE in importance	59	59
NOTED NO CHANGE in importance	40	40
NOTED DECREASE in importance	1	1

R = number of respondents
P = percentages

N = 100

Based on an increase in monies or activities, fifty-nine (59) respondents or 59 percent of the respondents perceived an increase in the importance of arts education in their buildings. Forty (40) respondents or 40 percent of the respondents perceived that arts education has remained the same in importance when comparing last year with this year. Only one respondent perceived a decrease in importance of arts education.

When responses were correlated with school size, no difference was noted. Generally speaking, large and small schools were reporting similarly. There appeared to be no difference between geographic locations and the type of response.

However, the sample in this case was too small to draw any definitive conclusions.

District Level

Of the 530 persons who received a request on this survey, 345 or 65 percent responded. The majority of respondents were assistant superintendents or directors of curriculum. A few of the respondents were arts education supervisors or district wide specialists. Nine persons returned the self-mailing cards without responses. Three hundred and thirty-five (335) respondents provided information.

The enrollment size of the districts ranged from as few as under 100 students served to over 500,000 students. All geographic sections of the country were considered. Both public and private systems were included. The following tables contain data on changes in personnel, curriculum development monies, and instructional materials monies. Each table contains the number and percent of responses.

Personnel

The respondents reviewed data in their districts and perceived a slight overall increase in the number of personnel working in arts education in their district. As noted in Table 2, 111 persons or 32 percent of those responding noted an increase in personnel in this field. Only 34 districts or 10 percent noted a decrease in the number of personnel teaching or supervising in the arts. The majority, 189 persons or 55 percent, reported a stable situation.

Table 2. Arts Education Personnel

Response	R	P (%)
increase	111	32
same	189	55
decrease	34	10
none	2	negligible
no reply	9	3

N = 345

Only two persons noted an absence of arts education personnel, while nine persons did not respond to this item.

Curriculum Development

When asked to analyze monies allocated to curriculum development activities, figures similar to the above category were reported. However, a slightly greater number of persons reported that they did not have monies for curriculum development activities.

Table 3 contains data stating that a majority (181 persons or 52 percent) of the respondents said monies remained constant.

Table 3. Curriculum Development Monies

Reponse	R	P (%)
Increase	109	32
Same	181	52
Decrease	32	10
None	11	3
No Reply	12	3

N = 345

Thirty-two (32) percent of the respondents noted that there was an increase in monies expended for curriculum development activities in the arts, while only ten (10) percent reported a decrease in monies for curriculum development.

Instructional Materials

As with the previous two categories, the majority, one hundred and seventy-six (51 percent), of respondents stated that monies allocated for the purchase of arts education instructional materials remained stable.

Table 4. Instructional Materials Budget

Response	R	P (%)
Increase	118	34
Same	176	51
Decrease	38	11
None	0	0
No Reply	13	4

N = 345

Table 4 contains data that shows that although all districts had monies for

arts instructional materials, only 38 persons or 11 percent of all the respondents reported a decrease in monies available for arts instructional materials.

Large Districts

When the data was analyzed, it was further categorized by size of district. All districts over 20,000 students were analyzed and compared to the total population.

56 districts had 20,000 students or more, with one district reporting over 500,000 students. 60 percent of the large districts reported an increase in at least one of the above three categories. 13 percent noted no change in any category. 25 percent noted a decrease in the number of personnel in arts education, which is higher than the overall total figure of 10 percent reported on Table 2 for all school districts.

Within the domain of increases, 23 of the 33 persons reporting an increase reported that increase in personnel. 23 persons reported an increase in curriculum development monies; and 21 persons reported an overall district increase in monies for instructional materials.

Table 5 contains a summary of the data from large districts concerning Personnel.

Table 5. Personnel - Large Districts

Reponse	R	P (%)
Increase	23	42
Same	14	24
Decrease	14	25.
None	0	0
No Reply	5	9

N = 56

When data from Table 5 (large districts) is compared with Table 2 (all districts), it is noted that there is slightly greater fluctuation in larger districts. There is both a greater increase in personnel (10 percent greater); and a greater decrease reported (15 percent).

Perceived Importance

Each participant was asked to record their personal judgment as to the importance of arts education in their district. This question was not meant to be a collective impression of the district. Rather, it was to be the perception of the curriculum leader in that district.

As shown below, 89 percent reported that they thought arts education was of high or average importance. Only 7 percent reported that they perceived arts education as being low in importance.

Table 6. Perception of Importance - District Level

Response in Importance	R	P (%)
high	137	40
average	169	49
low	25	7
no reply	14	4

N = 345

Similar data was received from the large districts (20,000 and over) as evidenced from Table 7.

Table 7. Large District - Perception of Importance

Response in Importance	R	P (%)
high	26	49
average	28	50
low	2	1
no reply	0	0

N = 56

Again, this data suggests that certain movements have not taken a toll on the status of arts education in school districts generally.

Obstacles

One open ended question invited respondents to record the single greatest obstacle to arts education in their district (if any existed). By far the two most frequent responses were:

(a) there is a lack of commitment to the arts as an educational priority; and,

(b) there is a lack of money, time, personnel and space for arts instruction.

The writers of this report see an integral relationship of (a) to (b). To the extent that there is a perceived lack of commitment, there will be other lacks. It may be a relationship of cause and effect. Even if one espouses a commitment to the arts and judges it as important, the resulting allocation of resources is the actual test of that commitment.

Only guesses can be presented as to the reasons for the perceived lack of commitment. An attempt will be made to articulate these reasons later. Irrespective of whether the obstacles could be considered causes, effects, or symptoms, they are categorized below. Three categories were established to place the comments in more adequate focus.

The first category is non-professional or extra-professional obstacles. Comments under this category dealt primarily with community, politics and funding policies. The second category is in-district professional obstacles. Comments under this category had to do primarily with professional teaching, supervision or administration of the school programs. The third category is professional preparation, non-district obstacles. Comments under this category had to do primarily with the preparation of teachers, supervisors and administrators. Overlaps do occur and are noted where applicable. Also, certain items were broad enough to be placed in all three categories or become the label of a separate category. Again, it is noted that lack of commitment and resources was the overriding preoccupation of the respondents.

Category 1. Non-Professional/Extra-Professional Obstacles

1. Lack of pressure groups
2. Geographic remoteness from metro/cultural centers
3.* Low regard for creative individuals and activities
4.* Low parent/community interest and support
5. Lack of defensible position

6.* Pathological preoccupation with stress on reading

7.* Failure of county commissioners to fund total budget

8.* Lack of organization of community programs

9. Lack of willingness of governor and assembly to support arts

10. Too many special interest groups (too many other competitors)

11.* Considered a frill by students, professors, community

12.* Need to reach various ethnic groups

13.* College preparatory is priority

14. Low cultural level of community and rural ethnic

15. Decreasing enrollment

* = applies to other categories also

Category 2. In-District or Professional Obstacles

(note above * comments)

1. Students don't see role of arts in their education

2. Rigid scheduling

3. Extra monies negotiated into salaries

4. Lack of general education curriculum

5. Fragmentation of arts by professionals

6. Lack of time to teach gifted

7. Lack of space, facilities

8.** Lack of imagination of building principals

9.** Resistance to interdisciplinary approach

10. Lack of understanding of role of art by total staff

11. No building level support

12. Scheduling competition (too many electives)

13.** Curricular infusion problem

** = applies to third category also

Category 3. Professional Preparation/Professional Not in District Obstacles

1. Lack of trained personnel (leadership, specialists, supervisors)
2. Teacher belief that art teacher must be an artist
3. Lack in elementary teacher backgrounds

Note ** and * items above

Although volumes could be written on the obstacles noted above, only a few paragraphs are devoted to the topic at this point.

If one hypothesized that a sound defensible argument for the teaching of the arts existed, and further that professionals in higher education were capable of assisting in the preparation of competent professionals in the school buildings, it could be the case that arts education would have many of the above obstacles do to a lack of community support and funding. However, with the above two conditions, i.e. defensible argument and qualified personnel, the chances that community support would continue to wane could be minimal. That is to say, maybe one of the roles of the school is to constantly "educate" the active citizenry.

Aside from the obviously complex political and curricular issues, certain points are apparent from the collected comments. Even though there seems to be a general support for arts education on the part of district wide personnel (and by principals as a matter of reflection), there is reason to believe that great disarray, confusion, and lack of direction exists. Further, it can be assumed that no one group can either be faulted or deleted from the complex causal scenario. That is to say, community persons, students and professionals have been mentioned as obstacles. In a more positive way, all three groups have a great opportunity to grow toward a better understanding of arts in education, its role and mechanism for more effective results.

State Level

Of the fifty-six Chief State School Officers who were contacted, 49 states and three (3) territories responded as of the date of this report. While many

of the officers wrote letters of endorsement or interest, most instruments were returned by a deputy superintendent or state arts consultant or supervisor. The tables that follow report the raw responses, not percentages to each of the items.

Personnel

The respondents were asked to determine whether or not a perceived change has occurred state wide in the number of personnel in arts education according to the three administrative levels of secondary schools, middle schools and elementary schools. Table 8 contains data that shows a generally stable field for the majority of the states. Eight states and one territory reported a decrease in personnel. Samoa noted that the number of teachers remained constant, while the number of coordinators decreased.

Several respondents noted that they were providing educated guesses. This was done because data was not collected in that state on the question.

Table 8. State/Territory Wide Fluctuations in Personnel

Response	School Level					
	secondary		middle		elementary	
	state	territory	state	territory	state	territory
Increase	15	0	13	0	16	0
Same	26	1	25	1	20	1
Decrease	4	1	5	0	8	0
No Reply	4	1	6	2	5	2

N = 52 with 49 states, 3 territories

Monies - Curriculum, Instruction

The next table contains data on monies allocated for arts education curriculum development and monies for instructional materials. The data are relatively similar to figures on personnel.

Table 9. Monies For Curriculum - Instruction

	Category			
	Curriculum		Instruction	
Response	state	territory	state	territory
Increase	12	0	8	0
Same	24	0	26	0
Decrease	7	2	8	2
No Reply	6	1	7	1

N = 52 with 49 states, 3 territories

On Table 9. even though the population (3 respondents) is small, each reporting territory recorded a decrease in monies.

Table 10. is the most suspect of the data gathered from the states in that very few states had data or regulations on time to be spent on arts education. However, most of the persons made educated guesses based on their observations throughout their states.

Table 10. Time Spent on Arts Education

	Secondary		Middle		Elementary	
Response	State	Territory	State	Territory	State	Territory
increase	3	0	3	0	5	0
same	38	2	35	1	34	1
decrease	2	0	5	0	4	0
no reply	6	1	6	2	6	2

N = 52 with 49 states and 3 territories

Judged Importance

This item asked for the judged opinion of the importance of arts education based on some form of data such as reports, ranking, or news releases. A majority of the respondents stated that arts education was of average or high importance. As seen on Table 11, 15 respondents reported that arts education was low in importance.

Table 11. Importance of Arts - State Wide

Response	State	Territory
high	12	0
average	22	0
low	14	1
no response	1	2

N = 52 with 49 states 3 territories

Obstacles

A last question to the states asked that the single greatest perceived obstacle in the advancement of the arts be recorded (if any).

These comments are similar to previous comments registered in the district-wide survey with the exception that the state wide statements were more sweeping or expansive in their perspective. Clearly, a lack of understanding of the role of arts education as an important part of a child's development and by consequence a lack of funds were the most frequent comments. The comments on this survey were grouped according to:

a. Commitment
b. Funds
c. Skills

CATEGORY A. COMMITMENT

1. non acceptance by people of the state of arts education as a priority
2. no understanding of the real value for all children by;
   a. local boards of education
   b. administrators
3. competition for scarce funds...back to basics demands
4. legislative attitudes

CATEGORY B. FUNDS

1. lack of personnel, facilities
2. lack of funds in individual districts

CATEGORY C. SKILLS

1. employed arts teachers are not agressive, no building programs or support
2. professionals, legislatures, state departments lack coordination ability, attitude of cooperation
3. lack of trained arts administrators
4. lack of skills to offset the fragmented approach to education... specializing promotes a stratified approach toward education.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions of this report are derived from the statement of the main purposes (page 2), and from the data obtained from surveys sent to representatives of three differing levels of educational policy making, i.e., secondary school administrators, district level personnel, and state education department officers. It should be noted that this relatively superficial study was prepared, among other reasons, to determine the need for further study.

Secondary Building Level

Data from this introductory study would seem to indicate that secondary school principals perceived either no change in importance of arts education in their schools, or, as in the case of 59 percent, that there was an increase of importance. Inherent weaknesses in the methodology render the conclusions less than reliable. These include the observation that generalizability for arts education throughout the United States is not possible with a sample size of 100. Also, the principals were asked to comment concerning the direction of arts education in their schools rather than current status. If current status was perceived as being low, an increase might have different impact than would be the case if it was perceived as high. Further studies to determine not only trend but also status would seem advisable.

Contrary to much expressed opinion, arts education seems to be remaining steady during this time in school growth that emphasizes the world of work and basics. However, because movements take time to take root in schools, it may be that in the next few years, the data gathered in a similar replication study would find a noticeable decrease in the espoused importance of arts education in secondary schools. Clearly, present funding strategies of Congress and H.E.W. suggest that one should expect a decrease.

Initial data derived from principals in secondary schools seem, however, to belie any (present) downward trend in importance or practice in secondary schools

arts programs. The current study indicated directions, but not under ying causes. However, a few knowledgeable guesses might be in order. First, it should be noted that more exposure due to increasing arts performances by superb performing ensembles and individuals are becoming available through television, radio, and live performances. More sophisticated knowledge leading to greater appreciation tends to increase numbers participating either as observers or performers. Public school curricula emphasizing an infusion of the arts in the total curriculum is presenting the inherent beauty of aesthetic activities to more pupils. More money and organizations stressing arts in the American culture is increasing the occurrence of arts both in the community and the secondary school. Finally, the movement in affective education emphasizing the opportunity for secondary schools to assist pupils in emotional and social growth has indicated the appropriateness of arts education as one of the more effective curricular means by which to achieve these ends.

District Level

The fact that 345 (65%) responded of the 530 persons who received a copy of the survey would indicate the importance with which the respondents perceived the topic. Of the 345 the primary point to be noted is only about one in ten noted a decrease in arts personnel, amount of money spent on art, instructional materials, perception of importance. Approximately one/third of the respondents indicated an increase in these four areas.

Responses when separated in terms of the largest 56 districts seemed to indicate an anomaly with approximately half perceiving arts as being important, half as of average importance, while one/fourth of the large district respondents indicated a decrease in music personnel. The current research effort cannot explain this variation and the researchers would consider it worthy of further research efforts. Discounting this one variation the responses seemed to be so similar as to suggest the possibility of a "halo effect."

The mass exodus from the arts field that is oft times noted was not perceived to have occurred during this period. Again, however, that is not to say that it has not or may not occur. Also, this survey did not differentiate between teaching and coordinating, nor was there an attempt to look at specific instances under the general rubric of arts education. As an example, further study might find a reduction in performance oriented junior high school music, but an overall increase in the number of persons in the general field of arts education. One may also find, upon further study, that there is a decrease in arts education teachers and a renaming of English teachers who teach creative drama, theater, and the like. Also, because many districts have a cyclical curriculum development system (curricular areas are investigated on a five or six year cycle) this data would have to be interpreted with caution. That is not to say that 84% of the persons responding to this item as "same" or "increase" are to be disregarded. On the contrary, this data again can be used to suspect the message of many persons who report on current trends.

Finally, if one hypothesized that a sound defensible argument for the teaching of the arts existed, and further that professionals in higher education were capable of assisting in the preparation of competent professionals in the school buildings, it could be the case that arts education would have many of the above obstacles due to a lack of community support and funding. However, with the above two conditions i.e. defensible argument and qualified personnel, the chances that community support would continue to wane could be minimal. That is to say, maybe one of the roles of the school is to constantly "educate" the active citizenry.

Aside from the obviously complex political and curricular issue, certain things are apparent from the collected comments. Even though there seems to be a general support for arts education on the part of district wide personnel (and by principals as a matter of reflection), there is reason to believe that great disarray, confusion, and lack of direction exists. Further, it can be

assumed that no one group can either be faulted or deleted from the complex causal scenario. That is to say, community persons, students and professionals have been mentioned as obstacles. In a more positive way, all three groups have a great opportunity to grow toward a better understanding of arts in education, its role and mechanism for more effective results (from page 14).

State Level

Probably the most intriguing aspect of the responses to the state level survey was the percent of responses received. Only one state did not return the questionnaire. With such a percent of returns it is possible to ascertain on a relatively solid statistical base the perceptions of state education department personnel. The response to the specific question concerning fluctuations in personnel indicated that approximately 30 percent of the respondents observed an increase in arts education personnel within their state.

This same did not seem to hold true for questions of curriculum development, instruction, time consumed in the arts, etc., where the majority stated that little change had occurred. The question of the general importance of the arts as perceived in some form of data derived from state records also indicated a situation or arts education holding firm with approximately the same number of respondents indicating an increase in importance as opposed to those indicating a decrease of importance.

Clearly, the most noticeable attribute of the studies were their modesty. They were an attempt to gain a large comprehensive overview of the state of the arts through the use of broad "brush-strokes." Even though this is the case, the writers believe that the data, including the many comments, letters and documents received, suggest a number of recommendations for panel consideration. What follows in this section are specific recommendations, reasons for the recommendation, and possible strategies for implementing the recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purposes for the development of these surveys were:

1. To assess perception of the current status of arts education.
2. To develop recommendations for strengthening arts education in American schools.
3. To develop policy shaping strategies.

In this recommendations section the following suggestions by the researchers seem appropriate.

Research

1. A much more rigorous survey of the current status (as opposed to trends) is needed to determine the present position of the arts in American schools.
2. Such research should be much more focused upon curriculum, instructional procedures, and objectives (cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domain).
3. The study of teacher training programs for specialists in arts education should be conducted, e.g., what sort of training is appropriate for a dramatics teacher, should a music teacher be a generalist or a specialist, etc.
4. A study of teacher training on the elementary level should be conducted, e.g., what arts knowledges and methodological knowledges should an elementary teacher have in order to achieve the aesthetic goals most appropriate for children in the elementary school.
5. The inauguration of a longitudinal research project should be considered in order to determine whether arts education is in the midst of a rapidly changing situation, or whether the situation is relatively stable. A three to five year study would be necessary to achieve this purpose.

Recommendations for Strengthening Arts Education

1. Some portion of the recommendations made in this section are based upon national policy, and, as such, will be more difficult to effect than others. For example, funding for Arts in American Schools should dramatically increase by the Office of Education. The National Endowment for Art and National Endowment for Humanities, while supporting arts in schools, in many cases do so indirectly, and also dilute their efforts through funding of other community arts activities. The National Institute of Education should be considered as a prime source of funding.
2. The development of a teacher training program for teachers of aesthetics should be encouraged. Here, specialists in music, drama, and art would be encouraged, but the over arching goals of aesthetic education would be stressed more than the specific objectives of any one particular field. The training of the aesthetic sense should become a center of all teacher training rather than only for those who are arts specialist.

3. Regional and/or state institutes should be developed to orient school administrators and influencial community figures to the importance of the development of quality of life (as practiced in aesthetic education) as being one of the primary purposes of public schools. Such institutes should be organized and administered by trained personnel qualified both in aesthetic and human relations in order to be most effective.

Often the case was made that the role of the arts was unclear, absent or in need of articulation. Further, it was noted that severe fragmentation in the field was occurring. Finally, a number of administrative problems existed. To this end, the efforts of a development team designing such institutes could be directed to:

(a) gather descriptions of existing exemplary programs

(b) design criteria for judging the effectiveness, cohesiveness, and exportability of the programs

(c) develop a position statement on the contribution of the arts (for national distribution)

(d) to propose curricular and instructional designs that promote an integral approach to the teaching of the arts

(e) to propose alternative administrative procedures to insure a balanced curriculum, and unencumbered scheduling process and a more open instructional delivery system

It is assumed that many fine programs and designs already exist. With the help of currently established resource mobilization networks, many of the above objectives could be met without "re-creating the wheel." As an example, for a minimum cost exemplary arts education programs could be described in a resource catalog and disseminated to at least every district within one year and for little money. The development teams primary purpose would be to determine the "judging criteria" for inclusion into the catalog.

4. A national symposium should be organized to consider further means of improving aesthetic education in American schools.

Such a symposium of nationally prestigious and concerned figures could indicate, not only means by which to achieve further importance for aesthetic education, but give further visibility to such efforts.

Policy Shaping

Recommendations concerning policy shaping procedures follow from the procedures utilized in this project, and from responses given by respondents. They include the following:

1. The methodology utilized in this project proved successful particularly at the state education department level. The contacts made with the individuals at the state education departments should not be allowed to lapse. Further research, discussions, and other sources of contact should be utilized to keep communications active.

An informal network of state level persons should be formed.

It was the case at every level of inquiry that both confusion and interest prevailed. Specifically, most states expressed interest in this study; many expressed a desire to share information and ideas; and some states commented on a general lack of support for the role of arts education. It was further noted that states vary in their degree of "know how" or extent of planning and resources.

An informal network comprised mainly of the respondents to the state level survey could be that vehicle to:

(a) facilitate the development of individual state rationales for the place of arts education in schools;

(b) facilitate the exchange of strategies that proved to be instructionally or politically advantageous for the arts;

(c) facilitate the identification of problems and resolution of problems of individual states, or the states in common.

This network concept could be easily tested out by asking for a response on the part of the state level participants. Further, the actual cost of this network could be initially carried by the states that participate.

2. Aesthetic sensitivity as a goal for American schools should be emphasized as a synthesizing factor between various educational professional organizations currently concerned more with specialization, e.g., music educators, art educators, etc.

3. Collegiate personnel, state education department officials, public school administrators, and community figures should be encouraged to continue a dialogue which can only prove beneficial to the development of arts education in the schools. This could be done by symposiums, publications, and/or continuing formal meetings.

The above recommendations are made with knowledge of the existing "Ad Hoc Association of States for Arts in General Education." This association attends to but does not preempt the recommendations to involve all the states, large and small.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

It would seem from the data derived from this survey and from the summary and recommendations drawn from that data, that the following conclusions might be appropriate.

1. Further research of a broader and more sophisticated nature is absolutely necessary.

2. Some form of symposium concerning the improvements of the image and of the visibility of arts education must be undertaken.

3. Further dialogue between the various people concerned with art in American education must be fostered in some organized manner.

Appendix A

INSTRUMENTATION

ASCD
THE ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT
1701 K Street, N.W. • Suite 1100 Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 467-6480

Dear ASCD'er:

During the 1975-1976 school year, a Rockefeller panel will be developing a status report on "The Arts, Education, and Americans". ASCD is assisting the panel because of its program focus and concerns for curriculum, instruction and supervision.

The panel has asked for certain base line data on arts education. They have provided an inclusive definition of arts education as: music, visual arts and theater, as well as courses or instruction in creative writing, dance, media (study of film and T.V.) and architecture.

In an attempt to determine whether or not there have been changes in arts education positions, monies available and attitudes, we randomly sampled our membership. You have been chosen to assist us in this very important endeavor.

Please read the questions on the enclosed blue card. After reviewing data from your district, please respond to the questions and slip the stamped card in the mail. This will be yet another way you have helped ASCD be of service to the larger community.

Thanking you in advance for your efforts, I remain...

Yours sincerely,

Charles A. Speiker

Charles A. Speiker
Associate Director

CAS/mkt

Enclosures

Executive Director, GORDON CAWELTI, Associate Director & Editor, ROBERT R. LEEPER, Associate Directors, GENEVA GAY, and CHARLES A. SPEIKER

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
No Postage Stamp Necessary If Mailed in the United States

FIRST CLASS
Permit No. 71476
Washington, D. C.
20006

Postage Will Be Paid By

ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION
AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT
Suite 1100 1701 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Attention: C. A. Speiker

Directions:

Using data from your school (comparing last year to this year), please respond to the following item.

ITEM

In *my building* the number of courses in, student time spent on, or monies allocated to arts education suggests that: (check one response below)

[ ] Arts education is increasing in importance.
[ ] Arts education is remaining the same in importance.
[ ] Arts education is dropping in importance.

My name is _____.

Our school building and staff serves _____ students (write in number).

When you have finished, please drop this self mailing card in the mail today. Thank you for your help.

C. A. Speiker
Associate Director

FIRST CLASS
Permit No. 71476
Washington, D. C.
20006

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
No Postage Stamp Necessary if Mailed in the United States

Postage Will Be Paid By

ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION
AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT
Suite 1100 1701 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Attention: C. A. Speiker

PART A

Directions: Using district based data (comparing last year to this year — 1976-1977) please respond to the following three questions by checking one box under each question.

1. The number of arts education personnel (teaching - coordinating in our district has:
   ( ) increased ( ) decreased
   ( ) remained the same ( ) district does not have arts personnel
2. The amount of monies allocated for arts education curriculum development (*not* due to inflation) has:
   ( ) increased ( ) decreased
   ( ) remained the same ( ) district does not have development monies
3. The amount of monies allocated for the purchase of instructional materials for arts education (not due to inflation) has:
   ( ) increased ( ) decreased
   ( ) remained the same ( ) district does not have arts instructional materials

PART B

Directions: Please respond to the following items. When you have completed the questions, just drop this self mailing card in the mail. Thank you for your much needed help.

1. In my opinion, arts education in this district is:
   ( ) high in importance ( ) average in importance ( ) low in importance
2. The single greatest obstacle to arts education in this district (if any) is:

3. My name is: _____.
4. The number of students served in this district is _____.

ASCD
THE ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT
1701 K Street, N.W. • Suite 1100 Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 467-6480

Dear

In pursuance of a recent resolution at the business meeting of the National Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, we are in the beginning stages of conducting a research study of the role of arts education in the United States. This first questionnaire is a shallow approach to ascertain whether a deeper level of research seems fruitful.

Also, a Rockefeller panel will be developing a status report on "The Arts, Education, and Americans". ASCD is assisting the panel because of its program focus and concerns for curriculum, instruction and supervision.

The panel has asked for certain base line data on arts education. They have provided an inclusive definition of arts education as: music, visual arts and theater, as well as courses or instruction in creative writing, dance, media (study of film and T.V.) and architecture.

Would you please respond or route the enclosed questionnaire to the appropriate personnel in your organization so that we may receive the information most germane to our needs. Your cooperation is appreciated, and we will be pleased to transmit the results of the questionnaire to you if you so desire.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Speiker

Charles A. Speiker
Associate Director

CAS/mkt

Enclosures

Executive Director, GORDON CAWELTI; Associate Director & Editor, ROBERT R. LEEPER; Associate Directors: GENEVA GAY, and CHARLES A. SPEIKER

DIRECTIONS:

Using state based data, (comparing last year to this school year - 1976-1977), please respond to the following questions. Please take into account inflation factors e.g. if more monies were spent on arts instructional materials, but the increase was due to inflation, then check remained the same. When you have finished, please place this form in the enclosed business reply envelope. Thank you. Appendix A, Item 5

Charles A. Speiker
Associate Director ASCD

(1) Personnel (teaching, coordinating) in arts education in your state

Schools:	Secondary	Middle	Elementary
number has increased	( )	( )	( )
number has remained the same	( )	( )	( )
number has decreased	( )	( )	( )

(2) Monies allocated for arts education curriculum developed during 1975-76

( ) amount has increased

( ) amount has remained the same

( ) amount has decreased

(3) Monies for instructional materials in arts education

( ) amount has increased

( ) amount has remained the same

( ) amount has decreased

(4) Amount of time allocated by State regulation to arts education in total instructional process K-12

Schools:	Secondary	Middle	Elementary
amount has increased	( )	( )	( )
amount has remained the same	( )	( )	( )
amount has decreased	( )	( )	( )

(5) The "judged" opinion of the importance of arts education in your state (based upon some form of data such as reports, ranking, news release)

( ) perceived as high importance

( ) perceived as average importance

( ) perceived as low importance

(6) What is the single greatest obstacle in the advancement of the arts in your state (if any)?

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

STATE OF LOUISIANA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LOUIS J. MICHOT
STATE SUPERINTENDENT
P.O. BOX 44064
BATON ROUGE, LA 70804

December 10, 1975

Dr. Charles A Speiker
Associate Director
The Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development
1701 K Street N.W
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Dr. Speiker:

Superintendent Louis J. Michot has asked that I respond to your questionnaire on the status of the Arts in Louisiana.

We have an anachronism in that dispite growth in the arts themselves there is little gain in monies allowed for support and the arts are still, overall, perceived as of average importance.

Several new target schools have been allocated to the arts, several parishes (counties) have added arts specialists at elementary level and many parishes have discovered the need for art and have added it to the secondary curriculum. We have more art people in the state than during the past years. Our States Arts Council has moved under the direction of Superintendent Michot and a great portion of the monies go into arts education. Our Superintendent has encouraged the arts in every way.

However, we consider the arts as living and growing, slowly but with purpose. The State Department of Education has increased the Arts Staff. Other states are not so fortunate as we are in correspondence and receive reports as to reduced state art personnel and art teaching staff.

We would appreciate a copy of your findings as they are compiled.

Sincerely,

Myrtle Kerr

(Mrs.) Myrtle Kerr
State Art Supervisor

MK:dm

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

COUNTY OF SUSSEX

18 Church Street

COUNTY SERVICE BUILDING, NEWTON, NEW JERSEY 07860

Office of County Superintendent
of Schools

383-2521

November 18, 1975

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
1701 K Street, Northwest
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20006

Attention: Mr. Charles A. Speiker, Associate Director

Dear Mr. Speiker:

Enclosed please find the form you forwarded to Dr. Fred G. Burke, Commissioner of Education for the State of New Jersey which has been routed to me for execution. I have filled in the blanks to the best of my ability and am enclosing it for you.

As an aside which perhaps speaks well to the condition of art education in New Jersey the position that I formally held, Director of Arts and Humanities, was eliminated as of September 18th since the state believes that more services can be delivered to people in the state with a decentralization of services to local counties. I am now in a county office in northern New Jersey with the title of School Program Coordinator. There is no one in a central position who relates to any of the disciplines normally connected with curriculum research, planning and development. This includes arts, math, science, foreign languages and etc. I sincerely hope that this information on the yellow sheet will be of value to you. I would appreciate being placed on your mailing list to receive any of the documentation that you develop. Thank you for including New Jersey in your data gathering process.

Creatively,

Al Kochka

Al Kochka
School Program Coordinator

AK:cbb

Enclosure: (1)

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
233 SOUTH 10th STREET LINCOLN, NEBRASKA 68508
TELEPHONE (402) 471-2295

M. Anne Campbell
Commissioner

December 10, 1975

MEMO

TO: Charles Speiker

FROM: J. Stephen Lahr, Art Consultant

RE: Research study on Arts Education

I am presently engaged in a very broad study dealing with visual art education, it proposes an appraisal of existing programs, K-12. The review of the related literature should be completed by February 1, 1976. The actual study should be completed by September 1976.

The purpose of the study is to develop a set of evaluative criteria for art education curricula, K-12. In developing the set of criteria a comprehensive search of the aims and purposes of art education and education in general has to be undertaken. There does not seem to be any consensus on these purposes, particularly in art education. In seems to me that in order to understand the role of arts in education, a complete understanding of the purposes, aims, goals, etc., of arts education in American Education should be developed.

If I can be of help in any way or if the study results will be of help, please feel free to call on me. My address and phone number are:

J. Stephen Lahr, Art Consultant
State Department of Education
233 South 10th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
(402) 471-2476

I highly endorse your efforts. It is a significant step forward when an organization such as ASCD which provides outstanding leadership in the field of American Education assumes a responsibility of this magnitude. Again, please call or write if I can be of service to you.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

R. Jerry Hargitt, President
9838 Grover Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68124

Willard H. Waldo, Vice-President
De Witt, Nebraska 68341

Frank E. Landis
824 Lincoln Building
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Walter L. Moller
112 West 3rd Street
Wayne, Nebraska 68787

Dorothy Creigh
1650 North Elm Street
Hastings, Nebraska 68901

Margaret Lockwood
1500 Gentry Boulevard
Gering, Nebraska 69341

Harold O. Peterson
615 South 67th Avenue
Omaha, Nebraska 68106

Marilyn Fowler
1904 Plum Creek Lane
Lexington, Nebraska 68850

CAROLYN WARNER
SUPERINTENDENT

Arizona
Department of Education
1535 WEST JEFFERSON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
271-4361

December 11, 1975

Mr. Charles A. Speiker
Associate Director
The Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development
1701 "K" Street, N. W.
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Mr. Speiker:

The Arizona Department of Education is vitally interested in the role of Arts Education in the schools of our state. We have an Arizona Alliance for Arts Education Organization which is actively working with an Integrated Arts Pilot Project (kindergarten through second grade) and contemplates expanding this project through the sixth grade in the 1976-77 academic school year.

Mr. Raymond G. Van Diest is the Fine Arts Specialist for the Arizona Department of Education. We, along with the General Education Division, and the State Board of Education for the Arizona Department of Education, are working cooperatively for extended opportunities in the Arts for students in the Arizona schools.

Enclosed is our evaluation of the items on the ASCD Survey on Arts Education for Arizona Schools. The Department of Education and the Arizona Arts Education Associations will be most interested in the results of this questionnaire and would appreciate your keeping us advised of the results.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. Ronald H. Warner
Superintendent

mn

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Mary Jo Livix
Mr. Raymond G. Van Diest

RALPH D. TURLINGTON
COMMISSIONER

STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TALLAHASSEE 32304

November 6, 1975

Mr. Charles A. Speiker
Associate Director
Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development
1701 K Street, N.W. Suite 1100
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dear Mr. Speiker:

Commissioner of Education Ralph D. Turlington has asked that I reply to your letter of October 16, 1975.

Enclosed, please find the completed questionnaire which you requested.

If we can be of further service, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,

Woodrow J. Harden
Director, Division of
Public Schools

WJD/cd

Enclosure

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BOX 911, HARRISBURG, PA. 17126

October 24, 1975

Charles A. Speiker
Associate Director
Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development
Suite 1100
1701 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Speiker:

Your letter of October 16 regarding a research study of the role of arts education in the United States has been referred to me by Secretary Pittenger's office for an appropriate answer. We are delighted to hear that the National Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development has resolved to conduct such a study and we pledge our support in any way possible.

We are aware of the Rockefeller panel and work related to the development of a status report on "The Arts, Education, and Americans".

Enclosed is the yellow sheet questionnaire through which you asked for some basic data. I am also enclosing several booklets that might be of interest to you.

Pennsylvania, through the leadership of Secretary Pittenger, former Commissioner, Donald Carroll and present Commissioner, Frank Manchester, has established a comprehensive arts in education program that functions at many levels of educational service. We would be happy to work with you and your staff reporting upon the many delights and problems of our effort.

Sincerely,

Clyde M. McGeary
Senior Program Adviser, Fine Arts
Division of Arts and Humanities
Bureau of Curriculum Services
Telephone No. 717-787-7814

enclosures

SOUTH DAKOTA

department of education and cultural affairs

Division of Elementary and Secondary Education State Capitol Building, Pierre, South Dakota 57501

January 26, 1976

Mr. Charles A. Speiker
Associate Director
The Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development
1701 K Street, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Mr. Speiker:

I am enclosing information requested in your recent correspondence. Also a copy of the publication The Arts and the Gifted is enclosed to provide indication of some of the efforts put forth in this area in the State of South Dakota.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Huckins

ROBERT L. HUCKINS, Coordinator
Education of the Gifted and Talented/
Arts and Humanities

RLH/rre

Enclosures

cc: Thomas C. Todd
State Superintendent
Division of Elementary and Secondary Education

Appendix C

1975 ASCD Board of Directors Resolution

1975 ASCD Board of Directors Resolution #4

4. DISCRIMINATORY BUDGET CUTS

The goal of education is the provision of a curriculum which meets the needs of each individual. If this curriculum is to be a viable one, it must include not only the academic subjects, but also, the aesthetic courses. Further, a viable curriculum, of necessity, provides for the inclusion of sound innovative curricular changes.

Courses in art, music, and drama, as well as, promising innovative practices are frequently among the first areas of the curriculum to feel the fiscal pruning knife under the pressure of federal, state, and local budget cuts. These apparently pragmatic but short-sighted eliminations are not in keeping with the goal of providing a curriculum for the well-educated individual.

It is recommended that the ASCD Board of Directors make provision for a position paper emphasizing the need for a focus on the humanities and the arts, as well as, the sound innovative programs in all areas of the curriculum. It is recommended further that this position paper be sent to the National School Boards Association for distribtuion to both local and state school personnel prior to annual budget planning.